

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)		2. REPORT TYPE Technical Papers		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER 2303	
				5e. TASK NUMBER M2C8	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory (AFMC) AFRL/PRS 5 Pollux Drive Edwards AFB CA 93524-7048				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory (AFMC) AFRL/PRS 5 Pollux Drive Edwards AFB CA 93524-7048				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT  Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT  A	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Leilani Richardson
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) (661) 275-5015

62

separate items are enclosed

C8

MEMORANDUM FOR PR (In-House Publication)

FROM: PROI (TI) (STINFO)

16 Jun 2000

SUBJECT: Authorization for Release of Technical Information, Control Number: **AFRL-PR-ED-TP-2000-129**  
S. Tam, M. Fajardo, "CO/pH<sub>2</sub>: A Molecular Thermometer"

**Fiz. Nizk. Temp (journal entry)**  
**(Submission Deadline: 21 July 2000)**

**(Statement A)**

1. This request has been reviewed by the Foreign Disclosure Office for: a.) appropriateness of distribution statement, b.) military/national critical technology, c.) export controls or distribution restrictions, d.) appropriateness for release to a foreign nation, and e.) technical sensitivity and/or economic sensitivity.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

2. This request has been reviewed by the Public Affairs Office for: a.) appropriateness for public release and/or b) possible higher headquarters review.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

3. This request has been reviewed by the STINFO for: a.) changes if approved as amended, b.) appropriateness of distribution statement, c.) military/national critical technology, d.) economic sensitivity, e.) parallel review completed if required, and f.) format and completion of meeting clearance form if required

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

4. This request has been reviewed by PR for: a.) technical accuracy, b.) appropriateness for audience, c.) appropriateness of distribution statement, d.) technical sensitivity and economic sensitivity, e.) military/national critical technology, and f.) data rights and patentability

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED/APPROVED AS AMENDED/DISAPPROVED

\_\_\_\_\_  
LESLIE. S. PERKINS, Ph.D  
Staff Scientist  
Propulsion Directorate

(Date)

# CO/pH<sub>2</sub>: A Molecular Thermometer

Simon Tam and Mario E. Fajardo\*

Propulsion Directorate, US Air Force Research Laboratory,  
AFRL/PRSP, Bldg. 8451, Edwards AFB, CA 93524-7680, USA

\* email: mario\_fajardo@ple.af.mil

*We utilize reversible temperature dependent changes in the IR absorption spectrum of CO molecules isolated in solid parahydrogen (pH<sub>2</sub>) to probe bulk temperature changes during rapid vapor deposition. The intensity of a well resolved feature near 2135 cm<sup>-1</sup> increases monotonically with temperature over the 2 to 5 K range. The thermally populated initial state of this transition lies  $\approx 8$  K above the CO/pH<sub>2</sub> ground state. During the deposition of  $\approx 100$  ppm CO/pH<sub>2</sub> samples, we detect temperature gradients  $\sim 10$  K/cm in  $\sim 0.1$  cm-thick samples subjected to heat loads  $\sim 10$  mW/cm<sup>2</sup>. The resulting estimated thermal conductivity (TC) is  $3(\pm 2)$  mW/cm-K, averaged over the 2 to 5 K region. This value is  $\sim 1000$  times lower than the TC of single crystal solid pH<sub>2</sub>, and  $\sim 10$  times lower than previously measured for pH<sub>2</sub> solids doped with 100 ppm concentrations of heavy impurities [Manzhelii, Gorodilov, and Krivchikov, Low Temp. Phys. 22, 131 (1996)]. We attribute this abnormally low TC to the known mixed fcc/hcp structure of the rapid vapor deposited solids.*

PACS numbers:

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The solid molecular hydrogens (SMH, i.e. H<sub>2</sub> and its isotopomers) have been the subject of numerous investigations,<sup>1-8</sup> with both pure and doped systems receiving considerable attention. The production of SMH samples incorporating a homogeneous distribution of isolated dopants is highly problematic, given the vanishingly low solubilities of most species in the liquid hydrogens near their triple points, and the virtually complete further fractionation of these solutions upon freezing. Because of this difficulty, most studies on doped SMH have focused on completely miscible "impurities" such as metastable J=1 rotational states, e.g. orthohydrogen (oH<sub>2</sub>) molecules in solid parahydrogen (pH<sub>2</sub>), and the six hydrogen isotopomers: H<sub>2</sub>, HD, HT, D<sub>2</sub>, DT, and T<sub>2</sub>.

An alternative method for preparing doped SMH samples is direct gas condensation under conditions precluding the formation of a liquid phase (i.e., reverse sublimation). Condensation of gas mixtures in an enclosed cell

20021122 009

## S. Tam and M.E. Fajardo

has been used in thermal<sup>9-13</sup> and spectroscopic<sup>6,8,14-25</sup> studies of SMH doped with Ne and heavier impurities. However, to achieve good filling of the cell, and optically transparent solids, cell temperatures must be over  $\approx 0.5$  of the hydrogen triple point temperature, leading to aggregation of most dopants present at concentrations above a few parts-per-million (ppm). Thus, absent some applicable spectroscopic diagnostic, it is very difficult to know uniquely the state of aggregation of heavy impurities.

Our new Rapid Vapor Deposition method yields millimeters-thick, optically transparent  $pH_2$  solids containing well isolated dopants, even at concentrations  $\sim 1000$  ppm.<sup>26,27</sup> We have applied high resolution infrared (IR) spectroscopy to probe the degree of dopant isolation, and microscopic trapping site structures, in these solids.<sup>24-27</sup> As-deposited samples have a mixed face-centered-cubic/hexagonal-close-packed (fcc/hcp) structure, which anneals almost completely to a polycrystalline hcp structure upon warming to  $\approx 5$  K. We are interested in how these mixed fcc/hcp and polycrystalline hcp structures affect our samples' thermal and mechanical properties. We also wish to better understand the rapid vapor deposition process; specifically: what is the temperature distribution in the  $pH_2$  solid during a deposition, and how does it influence dopant isolation efficiency?

In what follows, we describe the application of moderate resolution ( $\approx 1\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ) IR absorption spectroscopy to  $CO/pH_2$  solids to begin to answer these questions. While the notion of temperature dependent changes to the IR spectra of hindered rotor dopants in cryogenic solids is certainly not new, we believe our application of this phenomenon to thermometry is novel. An important *caveat* is that our experimental apparatus is designed




Fig. 1. Experimental Diagram.

## CO/pH<sub>2</sub>: A Molecular Thermometer

for easy optical access to the sample, and *not* for accurate cryogenic thermometry. We intend this report as a demonstration of the advantages of applying combined spectroscopic and thermal diagnostics. We hope that more experienced low temperature experimentalists will recognize these advantages and improve upon our implementation.

## 2. EXPERIMENTAL

Our experimental apparatus and sample preparation techniques have been described previously.<sup>24-27</sup> Here we concentrate on factors pertaining to the thermal performance of the liquid helium (lHe) bath deposition cryostat. Fig. 1 shows Top and Side views of the sample deposition region. The octagonal outer vacuum shroud has eight o-ring sealed ports for optical access and sample preparation; the liquid nitrogen (lN<sub>2</sub>) cooled aluminum radiation shield has matching openings which reduce its effectiveness. The 0.4 cm-thick BaF<sub>2</sub> deposition substrate is clamped in a gold plated oxygen-free-high-conductivity (OFHC) copper holder; all thermal connections are made with 0.01 cm-thick indium foil.

We use two silicon diode sensors to measure the cold tip and deposition substrate temperatures. For calibration purposes, we mount both sensors on the top of the cold tip, remove the substrate holder, and seal the radiation shield openings with aluminum tape. We calibrate the sensors over the 1.5 to 5.0 K range against the lHe bath temperature as calculated from the He vapor pressure<sup>28</sup> measured by two (0-10 torr and 0-1000 torr) capacitance manometers. These capacitance manometers are calibrated against the vapor pressures of water, heptane, hexane, pentane, and butane at 0 °C.<sup>29,30</sup> We estimate the uncertainty in the absolute temperature calibrations as  $\pm 0.1$  K (95 % confidence).

The final working locations of the two temperature sensors are best seen in the Side View panel of Fig. 1. The sensor labeled T<sub>A</sub> is attached directly to the top of the cryostat cold tip, the T<sub>B</sub> sensor is attached to the substrate holder at the furthest point from the cold tip. We routinely report T<sub>B</sub> as the "sample temperature" in our spectroscopic studies.


Fig. 1 also shows the location of the temporary electrical heater for calibrating the thermal response of the cryostat. This heater includes a single loop of 0.02 cm dia<sup>2</sup> nichrome wire ( $R = 5.2 \Omega$ ) epoxied to the front face of the substrate holder. Connections to the room temperature vacuum feedthrough are made using short 0.02 cm dia<sup>2</sup> copper wires ( $R = 0.5 \Omega$ , including junctions). This arrangement ensures that  $\approx 90$  % of the electrical power is dissipated in the nichrome heater, but the lack of

need to  
reference figure 1  
before it is  
shown

thermal anchoring of the copper wires results in an additional  $\approx 100$  mW heat load on the deposition substrate (*vide infra*).

The CO/pH<sub>2</sub> samples are made by codeposition of metered flows of  $\approx 300$  K CO gas and (nominally)  $\approx 15$  K pH<sub>2</sub> gas containing  $\approx 100$  ppm residual oH<sub>2</sub>. As depicted in the Top View panel of Fig. 1, the resulting solids have a variable thickness across the deposition substrate. Although the pressure of uncondensed pH<sub>2</sub> gas remains below  $\sim 10^{-4}$  torr, a second pH<sub>2</sub> film forms on the back side of the BaF<sub>2</sub> substrate, amounting to  $8.7(\pm 0.5)$  % of the main front side film thickness.<sup>31</sup>

IR absorption spectra are obtained using a Fourier Transform spectrometer (capable of  $0.1\text{ cm}^{-1}$  resolution) equipped with a glowbar source, a KBr beamsplitter, and a  $\text{LN}_2$  cooled HgCdTe detector. The IR beam interrogates a  $\approx 0.3\text{ cm}^2$  cylindrical volume of the pH<sub>2</sub> solid, centered on the BaF<sub>2</sub> substrate. The sample thickness at this point is determined from the intensities of the pH<sub>2</sub> Q<sub>1</sub>(0)+S<sub>0</sub>(0) or S<sub>1</sub>(0)+S<sub>0</sub>(0) bands.<sup>31</sup> We estimate the CO concentration from the IR absorptions as described previously,<sup>32</sup> using a value of 60 km/mol for the integrated molecular absorption coefficient.<sup>33</sup> In our CO/pH<sub>2</sub> experiments, these spectroscopically measured concentrations are a factor of  $1.35(\pm 0.1)$  higher than those calculated from the inlet quantities of CO and H<sub>2</sub> gases.



**Fig. 2.** IR absorption spectra of CO/pH<sub>2</sub> solids at  $0.1\text{ cm}^{-1}$  resolution. The left panel is for an 80 ppm CO/pH<sub>2</sub> sample that is 0.17 cm-thick; (a) as-deposited at  $T_B = 2.4$  K, (b) warmed to  $T_B = 4.8$  K, (c) re-cooled to  $T_B = 2.4$  K. The right panel is for three different as-deposited CO/pH<sub>2</sub> samples at  $T_B = 2.4$  K, each containing  $\approx 6\text{ }\mu\text{mol}$  of CO. The sample thicknesses are: 0.008 % (0.17 cm), 0.65 % (20  $\mu\text{m}$ ), 2.2 % (4.7  $\mu\text{m}$ ).

## CO/pH<sub>2</sub>: A Molecular Thermometer

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

*reference figure 2  
before it is  
shown*

Fig. 2 shows the effects of annealing, and of dopant concentration, on the IR absorption spectra of CO/pH<sub>2</sub> solids. Preliminary analysis of the spectra in the left panel indicates that CO molecules exist in solid pH<sub>2</sub> as slightly hindered rotors, with a rotational constant reduced to  $\approx 80\%$  of the gas phase value (a detailed analysis is still in progress, and will be reported elsewhere<sup>34</sup>). We tentatively assign the complex absorption pattern in trace (2c) to isolated CO molecules in the annealed hcp solid pH<sub>2</sub>. It suffices here to note that the features near 2135 cm<sup>-1</sup> are absorptions from a thermally populated CO hindered rotor state. The right panel of Fig. 2 shows the growth of absorption features near 2141 cm<sup>-1</sup> with increasing CO dopant concentration; we assign these features to CO dimers and larger clusters. We conclude from these spectra that the

*reference to table 1?*

**Table I.** CO/pH<sub>2</sub> thermometer experimental protocol. Entry format is: (a) amount of CO deposited, (b) amount of pH<sub>2</sub> deposited, (c) CO concentration, (d) estimated layer thickness, and (e) duration of each deposition stage. The total pH<sub>2</sub> thickness includes films deposited on both front and back sides of the BaF<sub>2</sub> substrate; other values are calculated assuming a front side layer thickness of 0.92 times the total pH<sub>2</sub> thickness.

expt.#	entry	pH <sub>2</sub> spacer	CO/pH <sub>2</sub> layer	pH <sub>2</sub> overlayer	total pH <sub>2</sub>
1	CO:	0	5.9 $\mu$ mol	0	
	pH <sub>2</sub> :	72 mmol	34 mmol	0	106 mmol
	C <sub>CO</sub> :	0	235 ppm	0	
	d:	0.094 cm	0.044 cm	0	0.150 cm
	t:	41 min	18 min	0	
2	CO:	0	3.7 $\mu$ mol	0	
	pH <sub>2</sub> :	137 mmol	59 mmol	0	196 mmol
	C <sub>CO</sub> :	0	85 ppm	0	
	d:	0.179 cm	0.077 cm	0	0.278 cm
	t:	41 min	18 min	0	
3	CO:	0	7.3 $\mu$ mol	0	
	pH <sub>2</sub> :	161 mmol	72 mmol	0	233 mmol
	C <sub>CO</sub> :	0	135 ppm	0	
	d:	0.202 cm	0.091 cm	0	0.319 cm
	t:	41 min	18 min	0	
4	CO:	0	6.5 $\mu$ mol	0	
	pH <sub>2</sub> :	0	52 mmol	136	188 mmol
	C <sub>CO</sub> :	0	170 ppm	0	
	d:	0	0.070 cm	0.183 cm	0.275 cm
	t:	0	18 min	41 min	


## S. Tam and M.E. Fajardo

overwhelming majority of CO molecules exist as isolated monomers in  $\sim 100$  ppm CO/pH<sub>2</sub> samples.

Table I shows the experimental protocol for the CO/pH<sub>2</sub> thermometer experiments. We perform four experiments in total: the first three involve the deposition of a pure pH<sub>2</sub> spacer layer prior to the CO/pH<sub>2</sub> deposition; in the fourth (control) experiment the CO/pH<sub>2</sub> layer is deposited first and then covered by a pure pH<sub>2</sub> layer. We record IR absorption spectra covering each 18 minute CO/pH<sub>2</sub> codeposition period, and then again during temperature cycling of the samples. We define the normalized integrated absorbance of the thermometer peak,  $A_{2135}$ , as:

$$A_{2135} \equiv \frac{\int_{2133.4}^{2135.8} \log_{10}(I_0/I) d\bar{\nu}}{\int_{2133}^{2153} \log_{10}(I_0/I) d\bar{\nu}} \quad (1)$$

Fig. 3 shows the raw spectral data, and a plot of  $A_{2135}$  vs.  $T_B$ , from expt. #2. The spectra (b) - (k) were obtained after the deposition was  
*spell out or define 'expt' in 1st mention of paper*



**Fig. 3.** Temperature dependence of "thermometer peak" at  $2135 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The left panel shows absorption spectra recorded at  $1.0 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  resolution during expt. #2. Trace (a) was obtained during the deposition of the CO/pH<sub>2</sub> layer and has been re-scaled by a multiplicative factor of two. The right panel shows a plot of the integrated intensities of the thermometer peak ( $A_{2135}$ ) vs.  $T_B$ .  
*spell out*




## CO/pH<sub>2</sub>: A Molecular Thermometer

completed. We note that  $A_{2135}$  is much larger during the deposition, see point (a), than expected from the measured value of  $T_B$ . We attribute this to the existence of a thermal gradient in the pH<sub>2</sub> solid due to the extra heat load during deposition. We also note that points (b) - (d) appear to fall above the trend established by the post-annealing data. We believe this is related to the conversion of fcc regions to hcp upon first annealing.

The left panel of Fig. 4 shows all the post-deposition  $A_{2135}$  vs.  $T_B$  data from all four experiments, and our fit to a Boltzmann equation:

$$A_{2135} = N \exp(-E/T_{CO}) \quad (2)$$

in which:  $E$  is the energy of the initial state of the 2135 cm<sup>-1</sup> transition,  $T_{CO}$  is the temperature of the CO/pH<sub>2</sub> layer, and  $N$  is a normalization constant. A direct nonlinear least-squares fit of the *post-annealing* data to this form yields our best values of  $E = 7.896$  K and  $N = 0.08602$  (a line fit to a plot of  $\ln(A_{2135})$  vs.  $1/T_{CO}$  yields  $E = 8.18$  K and  $N = 0.092$ ). We see no systematic deviations from the fit for any particular experiment, thus we conclude that  $T_B$  is a reasonable measure of the post-deposition sample temperature, independent of the pH<sub>2</sub> sample thickness. We do note that the *pre-annealing* data appear to fall  $\approx 0.4$  K lower than the fit; we will account for this potential systematic error, later.



**Fig. 4.** Fitting and reading the thermometer curve. The left panel shows all the post-deposition data; the closed circles show  $A_{2135}$  values obtained from un-annealed samples, the open symbols are data from annealed samples. The solid line is the least squares fit of Eqn. (2) to the post-annealing data; the dotted line is this fit shifted by -0.4 K. The right panel shows  $T_{CO}$  values during sample depositions as estimated from the  $A_{2135}$  data.

reference for Table II?


S. Tam and M.E. Fajardo

**Table II.** CO/pH<sub>2</sub> thermometer experimental results. Values given are measured before any pH<sub>2</sub> has been deposited, during the CO/pH<sub>2</sub> co-deposition stage, and after the entire sample deposition process has been completed.

pre-deposition expt.#	$T_B$ (K)	during CO/pH <sub>2</sub> co-deposition			after sample deposition		
		$T_B$ (K)	$A_{2135}$	$T_{CO}$ (K)	$T_B$ (K)	$A_{2135}$	$T_{CO}$ (K)
1	1.88	2.45	0.0065	3.06	2.03	0.0021	2.13
2	1.90	2.73	0.0115	3.92	2.08	0.0029	2.33
3	1.90	2.90	0.0157	4.64	2.14	0.0038	2.53
4	1.89	2.70	0.0045	2.68	2.12	0.0022	2.15

continue discussion  
of Fig 4 key figure is shown

The right panel of Fig. 4 depicts how measured values of  $A_{2135}$  are converted to  $T_{CO}$ ; the values obtained by inverting Eqn. (2) are reported in Table II. We note that both  $T_B$  and  $T_{CO}$  grow with increasing pH<sub>2</sub> deposition rate in the experimental sequence: #1 → #2 → #3. At the highest pH<sub>2</sub> inlet flow rate,  $\approx 240$  mmol/hr in expt. #3,  $T_B$  has increased by  $\approx 1.0$  K from the pre-deposition base temperature, and  $T_{CO}$  shows an additional  $\approx 1.7$  K rise across the bulk of the  $\approx 0.3$  cm-thick pH<sub>2</sub> sample.



**Fig. 5.** Calibration of the cryostat's thermal response, and resulting estimated heat loads. The left panel shows a plot of  $T_A$  (closed symbols) and  $T_B$  (open symbols) vs. dissipated electrical power. The large circles show the base temperatures prior to the addition of the electrical heater. The right panel shows the estimated heat loads during (circles) and after (triangles) the sample depositions vs. the pH<sub>2</sub> deposition rate.

## CO/pH<sub>2</sub>: A Molecular Thermometer

We also note that during the control, expt. #4, the differences between  $T_B$  and  $T_{CO}$  are not statistically significant. Thus, we can safely neglect the Kapitza resistance<sup>35-38</sup> at the pH<sub>2</sub>/BaF<sub>2</sub> interface relative to the thermal resistance through the bulk of the solid pH<sub>2</sub> spacer layer.

discuss  
Fig 5  
before  
shown

The left panel of Fig. 5 shows the results of our efforts to quantify the heat loads responsible for these observed temperature rises by use of a temporary electrical heater. The lines through the low power  $T_A$  and  $T_B$  data have slopes of 1.0 and 3.6 K/W, respectively. The increases in base values of  $T_A$  and  $T_B$  due to thermal conduction through the heater's electrical connections fit onto the extrapolation of these same lines, assuming a 100 mW conduction heat load.

Further assuming a value of  $A = 17 \text{ cm}^2$  (the area of one side of the deposition substrate holder) we can convert the observed temperature rises [ $\Delta T = T_B - T_B(\text{pre-deposition})$ ] into estimated heat fluxes during and after the pH<sub>2</sub> depositions, as shown in the right panel of Fig. 5. The straight line is a fit to the data obtained *during* the first three CO/pH<sub>2</sub> depositions only. The slope of this line is  $140 \text{ J/cm}^3$ , which implies the dissipation by the cryostat of 3.3 kJ/mol of pH<sub>2</sub> deposited. This value is much larger than the lower limit of  $\approx 1.1 \text{ kJ/mol}$  set by the sum of the vaporization energy<sup>5</sup> of pH<sub>2</sub> at 15 K and the heat released in cooling to 4 K. Since we do not monitor the temperature of the pH<sub>2</sub> gas after it leaves the ortho/para converter, we cannot be sure of the source of the additional heating. The non-zero y-intercept of the linear fit coincides with the average of the heat fluxes calculated from the post-deposition increases in base values of  $T_B$ . These offsets in  $T_B$  also scale (roughly) with increasing sample thickness, consistent with their being due to absorption of room temperature black body radiation by the pH<sub>2</sub> solid. Their absolute magnitudes suggest the absorption of about 10% of the black body radiation available at wavelengths longer than  $14 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ . *remove space*

In principle, we can now estimate the thermal conductivity (TC),  $\kappa$ , of the pH<sub>2</sub> solids by using Fourier's Law:

$$\dot{Q}/A = -\kappa \Delta T/\Delta x \quad (3)$$

in which:  $\dot{Q}/A$  is the heat flux per unit area during each deposition,  $\Delta T$  is the measured temperature difference across the pH<sub>2</sub> solid, and  $\Delta x$  is the effective thickness of the pH<sub>2</sub> solid. In practice, we find that there are still a number of arbitrary assumptions to be made which will affect the calculated TC values; we will attempt to combine these arbitrary choices to yield upper and lower bounds on the TC values.

Table III shows intermediate quantities and the final results of our TC calculations. To calculate an appropriate separation between the CO/pH<sub>2</sub>

## S. Tam and M.E. Fajardo

**Table III.** Thermal conductivity calculations. Units:  $\dot{Q}/A$  (mW/cm<sup>2</sup>),  $\kappa$  (mW/cm-K).

expt.#	$\Delta x$ (cm)	$\Delta T_{\max}$ (K)	$\Delta T_{\min}$ (K)	$(\dot{Q}/A)_{\max}$	$(\dot{Q}/A)_{\min}$	$\kappa_{\min}$	$\kappa_{\max}$
1	0.108	0.61	0.21	9.2	6.9	1.2	4.7
2	0.203	1.19	0.79	13.8	10.7	1.8	3.5
3	0.232	1.74	1.34	16.6	12.5	1.7	2.9

layer and the BaF<sub>2</sub> substrate, we note that not all of the deposited CO contributes equally to the IR absorption spectrum. The CO molecules deposited at the very beginning contribute for the entire acquisition period, whereas those deposited at the very end do not contribute at all. Thus, for  $\Delta x$  we use the sum of the thickness of the pure pH<sub>2</sub> spacer layer plus one-third of the thickness of the CO/pH<sub>2</sub> layer. This factor of 1/3 is the position of the time-weighted centroid of the CO/pH<sub>2</sub> layer:

$$\bar{x} \equiv \frac{\int xy dx}{\int y dx} = \frac{\int_0^a x(1-x/a) dx}{\int_0^a (1-x/a) dx} = a/3 \quad (4).$$

We use two sets of values for the temperature drop across the pH<sub>2</sub> bulk:  $\Delta T_{\max} = T_{\text{CO}} - T_B$ , and  $\Delta T_{\min} = \Delta T_{\max} - 0.4$  K to account for the possible systematic error in reading  $T_{\text{CO}}$  caused by the mixed fcc/hcp structure of the as-deposited solids. We also use two sets of values for the estimated heat fluxes:  $(\dot{Q}/A)_{\max}$  are the values plotted as open circles in the right panel of Fig. 5,  $(\dot{Q}/A)_{\min}$  are those values minus the (isotropic) post-deposition radiative heat fluxes plotted as the open triangles. We combine all these values to yield lower and upper estimates for the TCs:

$$\kappa_{\min} = -(\dot{Q}/A)_{\min} / (\Delta T_{\max} / \Delta x) \quad (5)$$

$$\kappa_{\max} = -(\dot{Q}/A)_{\max} / (\Delta T_{\min} / \Delta x) \quad (6)$$

We summarize these results as:  $\kappa(\text{pH}_2) = 3(\pm 2)$  mW/cm-K, averaged over the 2 to 5 K temperature range. This value is  $\sim 1000$  times smaller than the TC of a pure pH<sub>2</sub> single crystal, and about 10 times smaller than reported for doped pH<sub>2</sub> solids.<sup>9-13</sup> We attribute these abnormally low TC values to the mixed fcc/hcp structure of our as-deposited solids.

## CO/pH<sub>2</sub>: A Molecular Thermometer

### 4. SUMMARY AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

We have combined IR absorption spectroscopy with cryogenic thermometry to probe the microscopic structures and macroscopic thermal properties of CO-doped pH<sub>2</sub> solids. The main strength of our approach is its ability to establish the state of aggregation of the CO dopants in our samples. The main weakness is our inability to quantify all the heat sources operating on our samples. We are presently considering the possibility of extending our techniques to measurement of the thermal conductivities of annealed samples. We hope that this study will encourage other researchers to incorporate spectroscopic diagnostics into their thermal measurements, wherever possible.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Prof. T. Momose for his analysis of the spectroscopy of the CO/pH<sub>2</sub> system, and Prof. J. Rutledge for valuable discussions concerning the Kapitza conductance.

### REFERENCES

1. R.D. McCarty, *Hydrogen Technological Survey--Thermophysical Properties*, NASA-SP-3089, Washington DC (1975).
2. I.F. Silvera, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **52**, 393 (1980).
3. J. Van Kranendonk, *Solid hydrogen: theory of the properties of solid H<sub>2</sub>, HD, and D<sub>2</sub>*, Plenum Press, New York (1983).
4. P.C. Souers, *Hydrogen properties for fusion energy*, U. of California Press, Berkeley, (1986).
5. B.I. Verkin, ed., T.B. Selover, Jr., ed. english edition, *Handbook of properties of condensed phases of hydrogen and oxygen*, Hemisphere Publishing, New York (1991).
6. T. Oka, *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **44**, 299 (1993).
7. V.G. Manzhelii and Y.A. Freiman, eds., *Physics of Cryocrystals*, Springer-Verlag, New York (1996).
8. T. Momose and T. Shida, *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn.* **71**, 1 (1998).
9. T.N. Antsygina, B.Y. Gorodilov, N.N. Zholonko, A.I. Krivchikov, V.G. Manzhelii, and V.A. Slyusarev, *Fiz. Nizk. Temp.* **18**, 417 (1992), [*Sov. J. Low Temp. Phys.* **18**, 283 (1992)].
10. B.Y. Gorodilov, A.I. Krivchikov, V.G. Manzhelii, and N.N. Zholonko, *Fiz. Nizk. Temp.* **20**, 78 (1994), [*Sov. J. Low Temp. Phys.* **20**, 66 (1994)].
11. B.Y. Gorodilov, A.I. Krivchikov, V.G. Manzhelii, N.N. Zholonko, and

(initial)  
upper case  
for titles

**S. Tam and M.E. Fajardo**

- O.A. Korolyuk, *Fiz. Nizk. Temp.* **21**, 723 (1995),  
[*Sov. J. Low Temp. Phys.* **21**, 561 (1995)].
12. M.I. Bagatskii, I.Y. Minchina, and V.G. Manzhelii,  
*Fiz. Nizk. Temp.* **22**, 52 (1996), [*Low Temp. Phys.* **22**, 37 (1996)].
  13. V.G. Manzhelii, B.Y. Gorodilov, and A.I. Krivchikov,  
*Fiz. Nizk. Temp.* **22**, 174 (1996), [*Low Temp. Phys.* **22**, 131 (1996)].
  14. T. Momose, M. Miki, M. Uchida, T. Shimizu, I. Yoshizawa, and T. Shida,  
*J. Chem. Phys.* **103**, 1400 (1995).
  15. T. Momose, M. Uchida, N. Sogoshi, M. Miki, S. Masuda, and T. Shida,  
*Chem. Phys. Lett.* **246**, 583 (1995).
  16. M. Miki, T. Wakabayashi, T. Momose, and T. Shida,  
*J. Phys. Chem.* **100**, 12135 (1996).
  17. N. Sogoshi, T. Wakabayashi, T. Momose, and T. Shida,  
*J. Phys. Chem. A* **101**, 522 (1997).
  18. T. Momose, *J. Chem. Phys.* **107**, 7695 (1997).
  19. T. Momose, M. Miki, T. Wakabayashi, T. Shida, M.C. Chan, S.S. Lee, and  
T. Oka, *J. Chem. Phys.* **107**, 7707 (1997).
  20. T. Momose, H. Katsuki, H. Hoshina, N. Sogoshi, T. Wakabayashi, and  
T. Shida, *J. Chem. Phys.* **107**, 7717 (1997).
  21. T. Momose, H. Hoshina, N. Sogoshi, H. Katsuki, T. Wakabayashi, and  
T. Shida, *J. Chem. Phys.* **108**, 7334 (1998).
  22. M. Fushitani, N. Sogoshi, T. Wakabayashi, T. Momose, and T. Shida,  
*J. Chem. Phys.* **109**, 6346 (1998).
  23. H. Hoshina, T. Wakabayashi, T. Momose, and T. Shida,  
*J. Chem. Phys.* **110**, 5728 (1999).
  24. S. Tam, M.E. Fajardo, H. Katsuki, H. Hoshina, T. Wakabayashi, and  
T. Momose, *J. Chem. Phys.* **111**, 4191 (1999).
  25. N. Sogoshi, Y. Kato, T. Wakabayashi, T. Momose, S. Tam, M.E. DeRose,  
and M.E. Fajardo, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **104**, 3733 (2000).
  26. M.E. Fajardo and S. Tam, *J. Chem. Phys.* **108**, 4237 (1998).
  27. S. Tam and M.E. Fajardo, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **70**, 1926 (1999).
  28. R.J. Donnelly and C.F. Barengi, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* **27**, 1217 (1998).
  29. W. Wagner, A. Saul, and A. Pruss, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* **23**, 515 (1994).
  30. F.D. Rossini, et al., *Selected values of physical and thermodynamic  
properties of hydrocarbons and related compounds*, Carnegie Press,  
Pittsburgh, PA (1953).
  31. M.E. Fajardo and S. Tam, unpublished.
  32. S. Tam, M. Macler, and M.E. Fajardo, *J. Chem. Phys.* **106**, 8955 (1997).
  33. K. Kim, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transfer* **30**, 413 (1983).
  34. M.E. Fajardo, S. Tam, and T. Momose, unpublished.
  35. G.L. Pollack, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **41**, 48 (1960).
  36. J.S. Buechner and H.J. Maris, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **34**, 316 (1975).
  37. C.L. Reynolds, Jr. and A.C. Anderson, *Phys. Rev. B* **14**, 4114 (1976).
  38. C.L. Reynolds, Jr. and A.C. Anderson, *Phys. Rev. B* **15**, 5466 (1977).